

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending prior to entering this amendment. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Takashimizu (US Patent No. 6,040,923), Sakaguchi (US Patent No 6,490,057), and Suzuki (US Patent No. 5,856,879). The Examiner rejected claims 2, 5, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Suzuki. The Examiner rejected claims 3, 6, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Takashimizu. Applicant amends claims 1-3, cancels claims 4-9 and adds claims 10-26. Claims 1-3, and 10-26 are pending after entering this amendment. Applicant adds no new matter and requests reconsideration

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Takashimizu, Sakaguchi, and Suzuki. Applicant respectfully traverses the examiner's rejections.

Claim 1 recites *transferring the induced charges corresponding to the post region produced when scanning the first portion of the document to the front region for use when scanning a second portion of the document.*

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Takashimizu does not disclose the recited features. The Examiner, however, alleges the recited features are well known in the art, thus taking Official Notice of them. Office Action, 9/10/2007, page 3. The Examiner further provides the Sakaguchi reference to support the Official Notice, alleging Sakaguchi teaches the recited features.

The Examiner alleges Sakaguchi's photoelectric conversion element 9 discloses the recited optical sensing device having the recited front region and the recited post region. The Examiner further alleges Sakaguchi's electric signal discloses the recited induced charges.

There is no disclosure in Sakaguchi, however, of the electric signal being transferred between regions of the photoelectric conversion element 9. See, Sakaguchi, Figure 3; col. 7, lines 56-62; col. 8, lines 33-35, where the electric signal is generated by the photoelectric conversion element 9 and supplied to a scaling processor 20 via a CCD driving section 17. Put differently, Sakaguchi discloses the photoelectric conversion element 9 converting reflected light into the electric signals and supplying the electric

signal to the scaling processor 20, not *transferring the induced charges corresponding to the post region produced when scanning the first portion of the document to the front region* as the claim recites.

To crystallize this distinction, Applicant further amends claim 1 to clarify that the recited induced charges are transferred to the front region *for use when scanning a second portion of the document*. Sakaguchi does not teach or suggest transferring Sakaguchi's electric signal to the photoelectric conversion element 9 *for use when scanning a second portion of the document*. Since Sakaguchi fails to teach or suggest the recited features, Applicant asserts that the features are not well known in the art as the Examiner contends, and respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the Official Notice or provide documentary in support of the Official Notice.

Since claim 1 includes features generally similar to at least some of the features of claims 19 and 25, the combination of Takashimizu and Sakaguchi also does not teach or suggest claims 19 and 25 and their respective dependent claims.

New Claims

Applicant adds claims 10-26. Newly added claims 10-14 depend from claim 1 and therefore are allowable over Takashimizu and Sakaguchi for at least similar reasons.

Claim 15 recites *reading data corresponding to the light detected in the effective region of the sensing device without reading at least some data corresponding to light detected in at least one non-document region of the sensing device*.

Applicant and the Examiner appear to be in substantial agreement that Takashimizu does not disclose the recited features. Nothing in Sakaguchi, however cures this deficiency, as Sakaguchi discloses its photoelectric conversion element 9 supplying electric signals from each of its one-pixel units to the scaling processor 20. See, Sakaguchi, col. 8, lines 33-35. In other words, since Sakaguchi teaches supplying all of its electric signals converted from reflected light to the scaling processor 20, Sakaguchi does not teach or suggest not reading at least some data corresponding to light detected in at least one non-document region of the sensing device as the claim recites. The combination of Takashimizu and Sakaguchi therefore does not teach or suggest this claim and its respective dependent claims.

Since claim 15 includes features generally similar to at least some of the features of claims 10 and 22, the combination of Takashimizu and Sakaguchi does not teach or suggest claims 10 and 22 and their respective dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all claims of the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 224-2170 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP

/ Jeffrey J. Richmond /

Jeffrey J. Richmond
Reg. No. 57,564

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, Oregon 97205

Customer No. 73552